

FILED
08 APR -4 AM 9:29
U.S. DISTRICT COURT
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

E.K. Wade (Pro Se)
542 North Civic Drive, Apt. D
Walnut Creek, CA 94597
(925) 323-1578
ekpeactime@aol.com

Attorney for Plaintiff

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

E. K. Wade

Plaintiff,

vs.

**Elaine Chao, Secretary of Labor
U.S. Department of Labor,**

Defendants.

Case No. C 08-0021 JSW

**PLAINTIFF'S OPPOSITION TO
DEFENDANT'S EX PARTE MOTION**

To Honorable Judge Jeffrey S. White, Defendant Elaine Chao has had more than two years adequate time to properly investigate Plaintiff's claims raised in his complaint. No manner of further discovery can dispute Plaintiff's claims already presented to this Court. To allow Defendant another 90 days just to exacerbate Plaintiff's already stressful condition is simply asinine, stupid, and utterly unfair. Why must Plaintiff continue to suffer due to Defendant's trifling, lazy-assed ways of conducting business? Surely, it should not take Defendants two and one-half years to conduct adequate discovery. Or, should it? If Plaintiff was a Defendant in a murder trial, Plaintiff is certain that he would receive a swift trial with as little fanfare as necessary. Then why, for the love of God can't these Defendants conduct their business in a more expedient way?

E. K. Wade v. Elaine Chao
Opposition to Exparte Motion
C 08-0021 JSW - 1

338

1 Plaintiff humbly pleads with this Court to deny Defendant continuance for the
2 Second Motion hearing for July 31, 2008.

3 Respectfully submitted.

4
5 Dated this 4th day of April 2008

6 

7 E. K. Wade (Pro Se)
8 Attorney for Plaintiff
9 542 North Civic Drive, Apt. D
10 Walnut Creek, CA 94597
11 (925) 323-1578
12 ekpeactime@aol.com
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28